



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNited STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,366	11/01/2001	Shigeki Kageyama	4641-58231	3899
7590	11/10/2003		EXAMINER	
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN CAMPBELL LEIGH & WHINSTON, LLP			MAI, ANH T	
One World Trade Center, Suite 1600				
121 S.W. Salmon Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Portland, OR 97204-2988			2832	

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/016,366	KAGEYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Anh T. Mai	Art Unit 2832	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply filed after the maximum time for reply will be received after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any advantages of early filing under 37 CFR 1.136(a). See 37 CFR 1.704(a).

Stafus

1 \square Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2003.

2a \square This action is **FINAL**. 2b \square This action is non-final.

3 \square Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26,35 and 36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-11,13,14,21,26,35 and 36 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 5,12,15,22 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2. Claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Heinrich et al. [US 4621231].

Heinrich discloses an insulative substrate 57; at least a coil formed as a wiring trace of electrically conductive material in a winding direction on the substrate, the coil being divided at least one slit extending in the winding direction to form multiple parallel partial coils 51, 53, 55 of the coil; the winding trace is a fixed cycle waveform [figure 8].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4, 6, 8, 21, 26, 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinrich in view of DiMeo [4271370].

Heinrich discloses the invention as claimed as cited above except for connector unit formed on the substrate. DiMeo discloses connector unit 27 formed on substrate 12 to connect

the leg portion of the coils [col 2, lines 41-44; figure 1]. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use connector unit as taught by DiMeo to Heinrich. The motivation would have been to connect the coils ends together. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine DiMeo with Heinrich.

With respect to claim 26, Heinrich in view of DiMeo discloses the claimed invention except for integral connector unit. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integral connector unit, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art.

Howard v. Detroit Stove Works, 150 U.S. 164 (1893). MPEP 2144.04

With respect to claims 35-36, it is intended use of the claimed coil.

5. Claims 16-20, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinrich.

Heinrich discloses the claimed invention except for multiple sets of coils. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide additional set of coils, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

MPEP 2144.04

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 5, 12, 15, 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 5 recites inter alia, *a count N_b of partial coils is equal to divisor of a number of coils N_c facing a stator.*

Claim 12 recites inter alia, *each partial coil being separated from adjacent partial coils of the coil by a width w_2 wherein $w_2 \neq w_1$.*

Claim 15 recites inter alia, *cyclic profile is trapezoidal with mountains and valleys extending in opposite directions perpendicular to the winding direction and respective fold lines are situated in each mountain and in each valley.*

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Holland et al. [3726004] ; Seitz [4967156] ; Yamamoto [JP411219820].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh T. Mai whose telephone number is 703-308-2900. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin Enad can be reached on 703-308-7619. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.

am



ANH MAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER